REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 19-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7-10, and 20-22, the independent claims, have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,870,084 (*Kanungo et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,546,538 (*Cobbley et al.*).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 7-10, and 20-22 in terms that more clearly define the present invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the reasons discussed in the Amendment After Final Action And Petition For Extension Of Time dated October 29, 2003, and the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is a character-string information output apparatus for outputting character-string information supported by a predetermined character encoding scheme. The character-string information output apparatus comprises search means, extraction means, and character-string information output means. The search means searches, from the external memory, the character-string information having identical contents and supported by the plurality of different character encoding schemes, in a case where it is instructed to output the character-string information. The extraction means extracts the character encoding scheme interpretable by the character-string information output apparatus from the character encoding schemes supporting the character-string information searched by the search means, and the character-string information output

9

means outputs the character-string information supported by the extracted character encoding scheme.

Among other important features of Claim 1 are searching, from the external memory, character-string information having identical contents and supported by the plurality of <u>different</u> character encoding schemes and extracting the character encoding scheme that is interpretable by the character-string information output apparatus so as to output the character-string information supported by the character encoding scheme. That is, searching an interpretable character encoding scheme (for example, Shift-JIS) from among the plurality of <u>different</u> character encoding schemes (for example Shift-JIS, EUC, and Unicode) representing the character-string information having identical contents, and outputting the character encoding scheme that is interpretable by the character-string information output apparatus from among the plurality of different character encoding schemes representing identical character-string information.

As discussed previously in the Amendment After Final Action And Petition For Extension Of Time dated October 29, 2003, *Kanungo et al.* relates to receiving and rendering multi-lingual text on set top boxes of digital television systems. *Kanungo et al.* discusses searching multi-lingual text by font data (glyph). In a case where it is necessary to store and retrieve Unicode characters for languages with a large number of characters, such as Japanese, Chinese, or Korean, the *Kanungo et al.* system uses a glyph set arrangement that employs hashing means. Supplemental to that discussion, the Unicode, as described in *Kanungo et al.*, is able to achieve multilingual processing by <u>one</u> character encoding scheme. Accordingly, nothing has been found, or point out, in *Kanungo et al.* that would teach or suggest processing a plurality of different character encoding schemes, and in particular, searching, from the external memory, character-string information having identical contents

10

and supported by the plurality of <u>different</u> character encoding schemes and extracting the character encoding scheme that is interpretable by the character-string information output apparatus so as to output the character-string information supported by the character encoding scheme, as recited in Claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, and the reasons discussed in the Amendment After Final Action And Petition For Extension Of Time dated October 29, 2003, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is clearly patentable over *Kanungo et al.*, taken alone.

Applicant further submits that *Cobbley et al.* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Kanungo et al.* as prior art for the reasons discussed in the Amendment After Final Action And Petition For Extension Of Time dated October 29, 2003.

Applicant submits that neither *Kanungo et al.*, *Cobbley et al.*, nor any combination thereof (assuming *arguendo* that any such combination would be permissible) teaches or suggests the character-string information output apparatus as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent Claim 1 is clearly patentable over the cited art.

Independent Claims 19 and 20 are method and storage medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Additionally, independent Claims 7-10, 21, and 22 include features similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 7-10, 21, and 22 are believed to be patentable for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional

11

aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, and those in the Amendment After Final Action And Petition For Extension Of Time dated October 29, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,296 _____

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200